

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 12 are the independent claims.

Claims 4, 7, and 11 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,325 (King et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,366 (Yamakawa et al.).

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, setting a region of the selected R,G,B signal to be checked.

Independent claim 4 recites, inter alia, a minimum value detector detecting a minimum pixel level value in a particular region of a selected R,G,B signal input from a signal inputting unit.

Independent claim 7 recites, inter alia, detecting a minimum pixel level value in a selected portion of an R,G,B, signal selected from received R,G,B signals.

Independent claim 12 recites, inter alia, an abnormal state detector detecting an abnormal video signal in an R,G,B signal selected from among the received R,G,B signals based on a comparison of a detected pixel level value in
a portion of the R,G,B signal and a predetermined value.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither King et al. nor Yamakawa et al. teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 12. Thus, while not conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination is likewise deficient.

King et al. relates to a digital to analog converter with improved output level control and describes a multimedia circuit including a monitor 58. The monitor displays graphic image data on a display screen as well as full-motion video data in a window 56 on the display screen. King et al. describes that a user selects a digital color key value or a narrow color key range to control the multiplexing of the video and graphics streams. In operation, the narrow color key range is provided to an analog comparator 76, and the analog comparator 76 determines whether an analog RGB video signal is within the color key range. If the analog comparator 76 then

determines that the analog output is within the color key range, the analog comparator 76 controls an analog multiplexer 70 to pass the analog RGB video signal to the input of monitor 58. When analog multiplexer 70 passes the analog RGB video signal to the input of the monitor, the motion video picture is displayed in the video window 56. (King et al., Col. 7, lines 7-40).

The Office Action contends that this setting of the narrow color key range meets the aforementioned feature of independent claim 1. (Office Action, page 2). This contention is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, the narrow color key range of King et al. asserted by the Office Action is the range to which the analog output is compared. Further, the entirety of the selected analog RGB video signal is compared to the narrow range. In this way, the narrow color key range is used to control the multiplexing of the video and graphics streams. Thus, the narrow color key range does not select a region of an RGB signal to be checked.

The secondary citation to Yamakawa et al. relates to a method and system or calibrating a color copier and is cited for its alleged teaching of detecting a minimum pixel value. Applicant respectfully submits that Yamakawa et al. does not add anything to the teachings or suggestions of King et al. that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 4, 7, and 11, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that that King et al. and Yamakawa et al. do not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of independent claims 4, 7, and 11. In particular, as explained above, King et al. teaches that the entirety of a selected analog RGB video signal is compared to the narrow color key range.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 4, 7, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because

Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

Lastly, it is noted that at page 3 of the Office Action that Yamanaka et al. inherently teaches "displaying on a screen a message indicator (warning) indicating whether the selected R,G,B, signal ... due to deviation by more than an allowable range OR improper reading of data." This sentence is incomplete and, as a result, its meaning cannot be ascertained. Thus, the absence of a specific response to this contention of inherency is not a concession of the accuracy of the contention. And, regarding the other contentions of inherent teachings, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 20, 2005

By: 
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501